



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/253,117	02/19/1999	JOZSEF KIRALY	ASCI-006	5244

7590 01/28/2003

WAGNER MURABITO & HAO
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER

BROWN, RUEBEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/253,117

Applicant(s)
Kiraly

Examiner
Reuben Brown

Art Unit
2611



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 18, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/18/2002 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 3/18/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues on page 8 that, "Moreover, in Independent claim 1, each user device is configured to receive a stream representing broadcast information from either the server or another user device. This limitation is within the constraint of receiving and rendering, concurrently the broadcast information on the first, second and third user devices.

Art Unit: 2611

First of all, examiner respectfully points out that such a configuration reads on the user device being configured to receive the broadcast information from the server or the user device being configured to receive the broadcast information from another user device, but not both. Therefore the claimed configuration reads on Ice, since if either configuration is disclosed, then the recited feature is met.

However, it appears that applicant is asserting that the user devices are configured or enabled to receive the broadcast information from both the server or another user device, at any particular time, such that the broadcast information is concurrently received and rendered at all three user devices. Examiner respectfully points out that such a configuration is not explicitly recited in the claims.

Notwithstanding the above discussion, examiner points that Ice teaches that all of the clients in Ice are connected to the Internet, and are therefore necessarily enabled to receive broadcast information a server over the Internet, which reads on the amended claimed feature.

Art Unit: 2611

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ice, (U.S. Pat # 5,884,0331), in view of Ishida, (U.S. Pat # 6,122,259).

Considering amended claims 1, 8, 15, 24 & 35, Ice discloses an information transfer systems and methods for **broadcasting** files to a plurality of receiving destinations comprising the steps of: causing a transmitting communication Server A to transmit a first stream of data representing digital broadcast information to relaying client system C1 & C2, wherein server A and clients C1 & C2 may be coupled to the Internet, (Abstract; col. 1, lines 25-45; col. 2, lines 15-50). Ice furthermore causes client devices C1 & C2, to relay broadcast information the next level of client systems, such as C3-C6 see Fig. 1 & col. 3, lines 11-28.

With respect to the amended claimed feature of receiving and rendering the broadcast information in a first user device as well as the second or third user device to which the first user

Art Unit: 2611

device transmits or relays the instant broadcast information, this feature reads on the operation of Ice, col. 3, lines 62-67. However, Ice does not explicitly teach the additionally claimed feature of receiving and rendering, concurrently the broadcast information on the first, second and third user devices. Nevertheless, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to construct a system with as little delay as possible, thereby enable concurrent reception and display of information among all of the participating clients, since in fact all of the clients are receiving the same information. If the clients at the end of the relay (intermediate or last levels) receive their information with a significant delay, such an arrangement would represent a undesirable quality of service value for the instant clients, especially for live or real-time events. In fact, Ice suggests the desirability for limiting the amount of delay to clients at the end of the relay, by disclosing a predetermined number of relay levels and amount of clients on the last row to be tabulated, depending upon the amount of client devices in the first row of the network, see col. 2, lines 25-29; col. 3, lines 62-67; col. 4, lines 10-35 & Fig. 5.

Ishida discloses a system wherein video information is **simultaneously multicast** to all of the user data terminals in the system. It is specifically taught that each of the multipoint conference devices receives multicast data such as audio & video, and **displays the data on the monitor, while relaying it to the subsequent terminal**, col. 4, lines 21-27, which reads on the claimed feature. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2611

invention was made, to modify Ice with the teachings of Ishida providing simultaneous reception and display of audio/video data to all the terminals in a network using a relay algorithm, at least for the desirable advantage of supporting real-time communication or events, which is the purpose of Ishida.

Examiner notes that Ishida is specifically disclosed within an ISDN environment, whereas the present invention is directed to the Internet. However, as discussed above, Ice discloses that the invention operates over the Internet. Moreover, at the time the invention was made, it was known in the art that ISDN channels are enabled to support IP, i.e Internet Protocol, which is utilized in Ice, thus the two references are compatible.

As for the additionally amended claimed feature of the first, second and third user devices configured to receive a stream representing digital broadcast information from the server or a user device, the recited feature is still broad enough to read on Ice, col. 2, lines 16-18 & col. 3, lines 1-21. In particular, Ice discloses that when a specific client requests a connection to server A, in order to receive a broadcast, server A first checks to see if port 20 is available for the instant requesting client. If the port 20 is available, then the instant requesting client is connected directly to server A, for receiving the broadcast. However, if the port 20 is not available, then the requesting client is assigned to another client device, for receiving the broadcast information.

Art Unit: 2611

Hence, the disclosure of Ice meets the additionally claimed features, because the clients may receive broadcast information from either server A or another client device.

Regarding claim 8, in Ice the first group of user devices reads on C1 & C2, the second group of user devices reads on C3-C6.

Regarding claim 35, the instant claim includes the limitation that the server is configured by a transmission scheduler to communicate the digital streams to the first & second devices and that the scheduler maintains communication links between the sever and first, second & third user devices. Accordingly, examiner points out that Ice discloses that when the Server A receives a request from a client not in first level of clients, such as C3, the server A sends the instant client an instruction to connect to a particular other client such as client C1. Moreover C1 is instructed to transmit information to which additional clients.

Considering claims 2-4, 16-19, 27-30 & 37-40, Ice teaches a system and a method of transferring, communicating and **broadcasting** “files”, but does not disclose the specific types or content of the files. Nevertheless, at the time the invention was made, transferring and broadcasting radio, audio, visual television and computer program files over a communications network was very well known in the art. Ishida teaches the multicasting of audio & video data, col. 3, lines 35-40 & col. 4, lines 21-23. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2611

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ice to broadcast radio, audio, visual, television and computer files so that a user may access audio/video and program data in order to have a fully interactive entertainment system.

Considering claims 5, 11, 20, 31 & 41, Ice reveals client relaying communication devices C1 & C2, wherein the systems are capable of receiving files and further relaying and communicating broadcast files to a plurality of other users (Fig. 1). Ice furthermore teaches that for instance client device C3, will receive broadcast information from C2, in the event that its original provider, C1, becomes inactive, see col. 2, lines 18-21, which reads on the claimed subject matter.

Considering claims 6-7, 21-23, 32-34 & 42-44, Ice teaches that client device C2, which is comparable to device C1, relays the broadcast information to further clients devices, in the same manner as C1.

Considering claim 9, Ice teaches direct communication links between the first group of electronic devices and the second group of electronic devices (claims 1 and 2).

Art Unit: 2611

Considering claim 10, Ice teaches that the server A includes a database 22 holding a list of all clients presently connected to the network, col. 2, lines 45-55. This disclosure suggests that the system tracks in real-time the connection status of clients, thereby reading on periodically updating the status of the devices.

Considering claim 12, Ice teaches terminating direct communications links with terminals that disconnect from the server, i.e. become inactive, see col. 3, lines 44-50.

Considering claim 13, Ice discloses a first and second set of electronic devices each comprising a computer system configured for receiving and relaying broadcast information (Fig. 1).

Considering claim 14, Ice is directed to operating over the Internet.

Considering claims 25-26 & 36, in Ice each user device which seeks to receive information, connects with server A over the Internet. Server A then instructs which clients to connect with the other client and subsequently relay information. Ice also discloses maintaining a log of clients on the system, see col. 2, lines 45-54.

Art Unit: 2611

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE", for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner
should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (703) 305-2399. The
examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 8:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,
Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600